UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	ELECTRONICALLY FILES DOC #:
MARIA JACKSON,	DATE FILED: 4 30/08
Plaintiff,	
-against-	08 Civ. 1064 (LAK)
THE SCOTTS COMPANY,	
Defendant.	
х	

LEWIS A. KAPLAN, District Judge.

By memorandum and order dated March 27, 2008, I granted defendant's motion for partial dismissal of the original complaint and dismissed the Fourth through Eleventh Claims, and the claims for declaratory relief, punitive damages and attorney's fees, in their entirety and dismissed also the First through the Third claims to the extent they are based on events prior to December 21, 2004. Plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint which, apart from the addition of a twelfth claim for relief that already has been dismissed, was identical in all material respects to the original complaint. Defendant now moves to dismiss the portions of the amended complaint that correspond to those dismissed by the March 27, 2008 order. As has occurred on the motion to dismiss part of the original complaint, plaintiff has filed no opposition to this motion.

ORDER

"The law of the case doctrine precludes reconsideration of . . . question[s previously determined] here absent 'cogent or compelling reasons." In re Garlock, 463 F. Supp.2d 478, 480 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (citing cases). The only possible reason for reconsidering the previous ruling is that plaintiff defaulted on the motion to dismiss the amended complaint in consequence of having agreed upon an extension of time within which to respond to the motion, but then failing to file or obtain approval of the extension. This sort of failure is not sufficient. In any case, given plaintiff's default on the present motion, she certainly has failed to demonstrate any reason whatever for reaching a different result.

Accordingly, defendant's motion for partial dismissal of the amended complaint is granted in all respects. The Fourth through Eleventh Claims, and the claims for declaratory relief, punitive damages and attorney's fees, are dismissed in their entirety. The First through the Third claims are dismissed to the extent they are based on events prior to December 21, 2004.

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

April 30, 2008

United States District Judge